

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS PO Box 1450 Alcassedan, Virginia 22313-1450 www.emplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/826,738	04/16/2004	James D. Bledsoe	MP0985(13036/26)	1360	
60537 BRINKS HOE	7590 09/27/201 ER GILSON & LIONE	EXAM	EXAMINER		
P.O. BOX 103	95	SARPONG, AKWASI			
CHICAGO, II	. 60610		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		2625			
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			09/27/2010	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## **Advisory Action** Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/826,738	BLEDSOE ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
AKWASI M. SARPONG	2625	

	AKWASI M. SARPONG	2625				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the	correspondence add	ress			
THE REPLY FILED 15 September 2010 FAILS TO PLACE THIS	S APPLICATION IN CONDITION F	OR ALLOWANCE.				
<ol> <li>M The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following i application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:</li> </ol>	the same day as filing a Notice of replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	Appeal. To avoid abar t, or other evidence, v with 37 CFR 41.31; o	which places the r (3) a Request			
The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing			-1			
Examiner Note: If box expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b), ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN 1						
MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(	).					
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filled is the date for purposes of determining the period of ext under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the s set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ension and the corresponding amount hortened statutory period for reply origi than three months after the mailing dat	of the fee. The appropri- nally set in the final Office	ate extension fee te action; or (2) as			
NOTICE OF APPEAL						
<ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with Appeal has been filed.</li> </ol>	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the				
AMENDMENTS						
<ol> <li>The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, beautiful after a final rejection, beautiful after a final rejection, beautiful after a final rejection.</li> </ol>	nsideration and/or search (see NO		cause			
<ul> <li>(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below</li> <li>(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better</li> </ul>		ducing or simplifying t	he issues for			
appeal; and/or (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c	corresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.				
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.1)	16 and 41.33(a)).					
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12		mpliant Amendment (	PTOL-324).			
<ol> <li>Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):</li> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all</li> </ol>		imalı filad amandına	at concelling the			
non-allowable claim(s).		•				
<ol> <li>For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) I how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov</li> </ol>		I be entered and an e	xplanation of			
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:						
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:						
Claim(s) rejected: 1-4.7-8.17.19-38.43-56 and 58-68.						
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE						
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but</li> </ol>	hefore or on the date of filing a No	tion of Annual will no	be entered			
because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).						
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o</li> </ol>	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fail	s to provide a			
showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary 10.   The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation						
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	To the states of the stamp after of	nay to bolow or diador	ou.			
<ol> <li>The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet.</li> </ol>	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:			
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s).						
13. Other:						
/King Y. Poon/	/Akwasi M Sarpong/					
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2625	Examiner, Art Unit 2625					

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The limitation " wherein the software is stored within a device that includes the print mechanism" and "perform" the function added to Claims 1, 17, 27, 30, 40 and 56 will require further search and consideration.

Continuation of 11, does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The limitation "wherein the software is stored within a device that includes the print mechanism" and "perform" the function added to Claims 1, 17, 27, 30, 40 and 55 will require further search and consideration, and also applicant argues that the cited reference fails to discloses that in Okubo the new or upgraded processing programs retrieved from the server 7 are not resident on MFP 1.

In reply, Examiner agrees to the applicant's statement however the applicant is arguing a point that was not claimed. The applicant in the claims filled or 04/13/2010 claimed a system that comprises a software. This means that the software can be in any wherein the system, it can be on the server, MFP or computer. The claims as claimed on 09/15/2010 will be examined as claimed in the claims. The same argument was or resented for claims 17, 27, 30/47 and 56.